UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/845,196	05/01/2001	Irit Haviv-Segal	2261/4	2558

7590 07/16/2004

DR. MARK FRIEDMAN LTD.
c/o BILL POLKINGHORN - DISCOVERY DISPATCH
9003 FLORIN WAY
UPPER MALBORO, MD 20772

EXAMINER	
CHANNAVAJJALA, SRIRAMA T	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
2177	

DATE MAILED: 07/16/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/845,196	HAVIV-SEGAL ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Srirama Channavajjala	2177	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *16 June 2004*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *23-34* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *23-34* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to RCE

CONTINUED EXAMINATION UNDER 37 CFR 1.114 AFTER FINAL REJECTION

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 6/16/2004 has been entered, and a non-final Office action is as follows:

2. Claims 23-31 has been amended dated June 16, 2004.

3. Claims 32-34 has been added dated June 16, 2004.

4. Claims 1-22 have been cancelled, paper no. # 8.

5. Claims 23-31 have been added, paper no. # 8.

Drawings

6. The drawings are objected to by the Draftsperson under 37 CFR 1.84 or 1.152 as indicated in the form PTO-948, paper no. # 6, formal drawings are required in response to this office action, paper no. # 9.

Priority

7. Applicant's claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. 119(e) is acknowledged based on 60/199,008 filed on 4/19/2000 and 60/226,694 filed on 8/22/2000.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. Claims 23-34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Doerre et al., [hereafter Doerre], US Patent No. 6446061 in view of Copperman et al., [hereafter Copperman], US Patent No. 6711585 based on Provisional application no. 60/139,509 filed on June 15, 1999 .

As to Claim 23, Doerre teaches a system which including 'organizing and retrieving content of documents' [fig 2, Abstract], Doerre specifically teaches organizing and retrieving relevant documents, especially, paragraphs are integral part of document(s); 'providing a taxonomy [fig 2, see col 4, line 31-43, taxonomy corresponds to Doerre's generating content taxonomy related to multitude of documents as detailed in fig 2; 'said taxonomy having a plurality of nodes [col 4, line 37-43], Doerre specifically teaches taxonomy-hierarchy, root nodes, and leaf node are integral part of taxonomy hierarchy [see col 4, line 39], and a plurality of concepts' [col 6, line 53-55], concepts

corresponds to Doerre's concepts as detailed in col 6, line 53-55; , 'each of said nodes being uniquely associated with one of said concepts' [col 6, line 53-62];

'b) determining for each of said concepts, at least one comparison criteria including at least one word group, said at least one word group being a plurality of words in at least one specific combination'[col 8, line 4-12, col 9, line 39-48], Doerre specifically teaches text mining, data mining techniques allows comparing variety of data from many sources, further the process is in fact fully automatic that identifies multiword terms is part of text analysis function as detailed in col 9;

'c) providing a plurality of documents' [col 3, line 3-4, col 4, line 34-37, fig 2], plurality of documents corresponds to Doerre's fig 2, 210 and 211;

' 'e)(i: 'comparing the content' [col 6, line 13-16] of 'comparison criteria for each of said nodes of said taxonomy' [col 13, line 24-31];

'(ii) 'at least one matching node of said nodes of said taxonomy' [col 14, line 35-38, line 48-51, col 16, line 21-27];

'(f) navigating said taxonomy by a user in order to locate a desired node of said nodes associated with a concept of internet of said user' [col 16, line 12-19];

'(g) displaying the content, linked to said desired node' [col 16, line 17-19], Doerre specifically suggests browsing desired tree taxonomy that will display on the screen that corresponds to displaying the content.

It is however, noted that Doerre does not specifically teach 'dividing all of said documents into a plurality of paragraphs, classifying said paragraphs, comparing the

content of each said paragraphs, creating links between each of said paragraphs, displaying the content of said paragraphs, although Doerre specifically teaches building hierarchical taxonomy level through subset of the documents, further it is noted that paragraphs, phrases, multiple words are integral part of document(s). On the other hand, Copperman disclosed dividing all of said documents into a plurality of paragraphs [see col 16, line 28-33], Copperman specifically teaches dividing the documents into discreae sections called slicing a document that corresponds to dividing documents into plurality of paragraphs; 'classifying said paragraphs, comparing the content of each said paragraphs' [col 16, line 53-59, col 21 line 60-67], 'creating links between each of said paragraphs' [col 21, line 60-67], 'displaying the content of said paragraphs' [col 37, line 49-53].

It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to incorporate the teachings of Copperman et al. into Taxonomy generation for document collections of Doerre et al., because both Doerre and Copperman are directed to Taxonomy, more specifically Doerre is directed to taxonomy generation step that generates, selected subset of documents, in other words, selectivevity of taxonomy generation using hierarchical taxonomy [see Abstract, col 4, line 31-52], while Copperman is directed to retrieving documents using taxonomies that classify, autocontextualizer of documents using expert system [see Abstract] and both are from same field of endeavor. It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to combine the references because that

would have allowed users of Doerre to divide documents into various small paragraphs and establishing associated links between respective paragraphs that allows to create taxonomy tags, classifying paragraphs as shown in Copperman's fig 6, and further in identifying specific match between query and concept nodes of taxonomy based on the actual word(s) in the document , thus system allows quickly deliver the content in timely manner, improving quality and reliability of information [see col 2, line 5-6,50-59].

9. As to Claim 24, 28, most of the limitations of this claim have been noted in the rejection of Claim 23 above. In addition, with respect to the claimed feature both Doerre and Copperman disclosed 'taxonomy is hierarchical, said plurality of nodes including a root node and a plurality of sub-nodes below said root node' [see Doerre: fig 2, col 4, line 35-39; Copperman: fig 4, col 10, line 36-46]; 'each of said sub-nodes having only one parent node, [see fig 4, Copperman]; 'each of said parent nodes having at least one of said sub-nodes as a child node thereof, each of said sub-nodes being associated with a concept which is narrower sub-concept of a concept associated with a corresponding one of said parent nodes' [Copperman see fig 4, 11-21,col 29, line 16-41].

10. As to Claim 25, 29, most of the limitations of this claim have been noted in the rejection of Claim 24 above. In addition, with respect to the claimed feature Doerre disclosed 'navigating includes navigating said taxonomy from said root node to said desired node by said user' [col 16, line 12-17].

11. As to Claim 26, 30, most of the limitations of this claim have been noted in the rejection of Claim 23 above. In addition, with respect to the claimed feature Copperman disclosed 'displaying includes displaying the conternt said paragraphs linked to said desired node in a scrollable window, said scrollable window having a plurality of scrollable sub-windows, each f said scrollable sub-windows displaying the content of one of said paragraphs linked to said desired node' [see fig 7, fig 21-22], Copperman specifically teaches interactive dialog where user can manipulate content through user interface, further it is also noted that content have been displayed as detailed in f ig 22, windows, sub-windows are integral part of user interface.

12. As to Claim 27, 31-34, Doerre teaches a system which including 'organizing and retrieving content of documents' [fig 2, Abstract], Doerre specifically teaches organizing and retrieving relevant documents, especially, paragraphs are integral part of document(s); 'a database, said database including a taxonomy and plurality of documents [fig 2, see col 4, line 31-43, taxonomy corresponds to Doerre's generating content taxonomy related to multitude of documents as detailed in fig 2, a database corresponds to document database as detailed in fig 2, element 210;; 'said taxonomy having a plurality of nodes [col 4, line 37-43], Doerre specifically teaches taxonomy-hierarchy, root nodes, and leaf node are integral part of taxonomy hierarchy [see col 4, line 39], 'each of said nodes being uniquely associated with a concept' [col 6, line 53-62], concepts corresponds to Doerre's concepts as detailed in col 6, line 53-55; 'each of said nodes being associated with at least one comparison criteria including at least one

word group, said word group being a plurality of words in at least one specific combination' [col 8, line 4-12, col 9, line 39-48], Doerre specifically teaches text mining, data mining techniques allows comparing variety of data from many sources, further the process is in fact fully automatic that identifies multiword terms is part of text analysis function as detailed in col 9;

'b(i)) documents' [col 3, line 3-4, col 4, line 34-37, fig 2], documents corresponds to Doerre's fig 2, 210 and 211;

(ii)(I)) 'comparing the content' [col 6, line 13-16] of 'comparison criteria for each of said taxonomy' [col 13, line 24-31];

'(II) 'at least one matching node of said nodes of said taxonomy' [col 14, line 35-38, line 48-51, col 16, line 21-27];

'© a user interface configured for allowing a user to navigate said taxonomy in order to locate a desired node of said nodes associated with a concept of internet of said user' [col 16, line 12-19];

'(d) a display device configured for displaying the content linked to said desired node' [col 16, line 17-19], Doerre specifically suggests browsing desired tree taxonomy that will display on the screen that corresponds to displaying the content.

It is however, noted that Doerre does not specifically teach 'dividing all of said documents into a plurality of paragraphs, classifying said paragraphs, comparing the content of each said paragraphs, creating links in said database between each of said paragraphs, displaying the content of said paragraphs, although Doerre specifically

teaches building hierarchical taxonomy level through subset of the documents, further it is noted that paragraphs, phrases, multiple words are integral part of document(s). On the other hand, Copperman disclosed dividing all of said documents into a plurality of paragraphs [see col 16, line 28-33], Copperman specifically teaches dividing the documents into discrete sections called slicing a document that corresponds to dividing documents into plurality of paragraphs; 'classifying said paragraphs, comparing the content of each said paragraphs' [col 16, line 53-59, col 21 line 60-67], 'creating links between each of said paragraphs' [col 21, line 60-67], 'displaying the content of said paragraphs' [col 37, line 49-53].

It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to incorporate the teachings of Copperman et al. into Taxonomy generation for document collections of Doerre et al., because both Doerre and Copperman are directed to Taxonomy, more specifically Doerre is directed to taxonomy generation step that generates, selected subset of documents, in other words, selectivevity of taxonomy generation using hierarchical taxonomy [see Abstract, col 4, line 31-52], while Copperman is directed to retrieving documents using taxonomies that classify, autocontextualizer of documents using expert system [see Abstract] and both are from same field of endeavor. It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to combine the references because that would have allowed users of Doerre to divide documents into various small paragraphs and establishing associated links between respective paragraphs that allows to create

taxonomy tags, classifying paragraphs as shown in Copperman's fig 6, and further in identifying specific match between query and concept nodes of taxonomy based on the actual word(s) in the document , thus system allows quickly deliver the content in timely manner, improving quality and reliability of information [see col 2, line 5-6,50-59].

Response to Arguments

13. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 23-34 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

In response to applicant's amendment and especially remarks at page 8-14, Examiner rejected pending claims 23-34 as stated above.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record

a.	US Patent No.	6446061
b.	US Patent No.	6711585

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure

c.	US Patent No.	6078924
d.	US Patent No.	6665681
e.	US Patent No.	5625767
f.	US Patent No.	6442545
g.	US Patent No.	5768580
h.	US Pub.	2003/0120662
i.	60/139,509	

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Srirama Channavajjala whose telephone number is (703) 308-8538. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 8:00 AM to 5:30 PM Eastern Time. The TC2100's Customer Service number is (703) 306-5631.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John E. Breene, can be reached on (703) 305-9790. The fax phone numbers for the organization where the application or proceeding is assigned are as follows:

703/872-9306 **(Offical Communications)**

Any inquiry of general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-9600.

sc
Patent Examiner.
July 13, 2004

SRIRAMA CHANNAVAJJALA
PRIMARY EXAMINER